

University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

4-24-2000

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 24, 2000

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2000 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 24, 2000" (2000). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1103.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1103

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Summary of Faculty Senate Meeting 4/10/00

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for Press Identification
2. Comments from Chair McDevitt
3. Comments from Chair Kelly
4. Comments from Provost Podolefsky

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

744 Request approval of the honors committee report

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) to docket this for the April 24 meeting.

745 Request for Emeritus Status, Mahmood Yousefi, Department of Economics

Power moved (Cooper seconded) to docket in regular order.

Motion carried. Docketed as item 661.

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

Emeritus Policy

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) to move off the table.

Motion carried.

Nelson moved (Romanin seconded) that we receive the report from the Educational Policy Committee.

Motion carried.

Cooper moved that we officially mark in the policy that we do award posthumously.

Nelson moved (Bowlin seconded) we refer the document to an ad hoc committee to consist of the Chair of the Senate, the Chair of the Faculty and Mr. Mixsell, Administrative Services Coordinator.

Motion carried

Report of the Education Policy Commission (Calendar item 752, Docket number 648)

Utz moved (Jurgenson seconded) that the Senate receive the report of the Education Policy Commission.

Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

656 Report of the Calendar Committee

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) we approve the recommendations of the Calendar Committee regarding the revised Academic Calendars for 2001-2002.

Motion carried with 2 no votes.

657 Request for Changes to Policies for Graduating with Honors

Jurgenson moved (?????seconded) to send this to the EPC Committee

Motion carried.

658 Request for Emeritus Status, Charles Strein, Department of Economics

Nelson moved (Cooper seconded) to approve.

Motion carried.

659 Receive report of the Committee on Admission and Retention

Nelson moved (Utz seconded) that we receive the report.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Romanin moved (Christensen seconded) to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn carried

Meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

Minutes of the University Faculty Senate Meeting

1555

PRESENT: Michael Blackwell, Bud Bowlin, David Christensen, Carol Cooper, Lyn Countryman, Jim Jurgenson, Jim Kelly, Syed Kirmani, Suzanne McDevitt, Lauren Nelson, Chris Ogbondah, Dan Power, Tom Romanin, Laura Terlip, Richard Utz, Mary Boes for Katherine vanWormer, Barbara Weeg.

ABSENT: Kenneth Basom, Karen Couch Breitbach, Shahram Varzavand.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair McDevitt called the Senate to order at 3:16 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jurgenson moved (Utz seconded) that the minutes of March 27, 2000 be approved.

Minutes were approved with the following corrections:

Page 3, last sentence in paragraph 1, changed to read: All we can do at this point is weigh alternatives.

Page 6, paragraph 3, changed to read: Speaking for himself, East said.....

Minutes were approved with the stated changes.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION: Jeff Scudder, Northern Iowan and Andrew Wind, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR McDEVITT:

Chair McDevitt deferred her comments till the next meeting in the interest of keeping the meeting to a reasonable length.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR KELLY:

Faculty Chair Kelly deferred his comments.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY:

Provost Podolefsky reported that Barbara Safford had been appointed to the Intellectual Property Committee.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

744 Request approval of the honors committee report

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) to docket this for the April 24 meeting.

Bowlin expressed his disapproval of receiving docket sheets in the packet with no information attached and being expected to vote without being able to review the material before the meeting.

Motion carried with 1 vote no. Docketed as item 660.

745 Request for Emeritus Status, Mahmood Yousefi, Department of Economics

Power moved (Cooper seconded) to docket in regular order.
Motion carried. Docketed as item 661.

NEW BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

Emeritus Policy

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) to move off the table.
Motion carried.

Chair McDevitt reminded the Senate that the response from the Educational Policy Committee stated that when considering the question of Emeritus Policy the Educational Policy Committee determined that it was neither an educational nor curricular matter, hence it was not appropriate for them to consider it. Their discussion included the comment that some of the issues may

have master contract implications, hence the Senate may want to direct it to United Faculty for their consideration. The Emeritus Policy issue was tabled at the last Senate meeting to look at the old materials. The material that brought the matter to the attention of the Senate again was a memo from Mike Mixsell which requested that the Emeritus Policy be simplified. A proposal to revise the Emeritus Policy was brought forward which would have stated that eligibility criteria are unchanged except that posthumous nominations may now be submitted.

Application/nomination and approval processes also remain unchanged. The significant difference is the removal of the specific listing of privileges accorded to Emeriti due to the difficulty in keeping both the policy and the Emeritus Association bylaws current with University policy. This proposal establishes a direct dialogue between the Emeritus Association and the University Administration regarding such privileges.

Nelson moved (Romanin seconded) that we receive the report from the Educational Policy Committee.

Motion carried.

The second part of this issue is for the Senate to consider what the EPC was addressing in its response. The policy was the response which came to the Senate in March of 1999. It specified a number of individual benefits and privileges. The document is dated February 16, 1999. It specifies that Emeritus Policy may continue to enjoy the same library privileges, use audio visual equipment, media production services, attain parking, office space and normal office space when available as long as space is not required by current program operations. There is also a section on Emeritus spouses. Cooper asked if posthumously has been accepted as a change in the policy and it has.

Cooper suggested that we officially mark in the policy that we do award posthumously.

The other significant changes are that the policy would not specifically list the privileges. Those would be negotiated on an ongoing basis between the Emeritus Association and the Administration.

Cooper said these privileges need to be somewhere where the faculty and public can see it. People need to be aware of what privileges are available. It would be good to have this information displayed on the web. Mixsell said he envisions this will be included in a faculty handbook. Bowlin said he thought, when this was referred to the EPC, that we had asked them to take a look at what Scott Cawelti had proposed. Bowlin commented that he thought we wanted to look at this as a whole package and not piecemeal, which is what we are starting to do. Maybe we should establish an ad hoc committee of the Senate to review this whole policy. Romanin agreed that we need a whole package to look at. Scott Cawelti's document was dated October 20, 1998 and we need time now to pull this together. McDevitt pointed out that on October 23, 1998 there was a motion made that the term Emeritus Faculty be used to designate those members, and this encompasses the proposal that was brought from Scott Cawelti and the Emeritus Association. So this was dealt with. The term Emeritus Faculty is used to designate those members of the Emeritus Faculty with a minimum of ten years service to UNI as well as a minimum of twenty years of credible service in higher education, which may or may not include years at UNI, who have terminated permanent employment at this university. That was approved on 11/23/98 so that should already appear as part of the policy. The

proposed changes would or would not be integrated into the policy. Weeg agreed that all information should be brought together and dealt with it as a whole.

Mixsell said he would happy to work with the Senate to construct something.

Nelson moved (Bowlin seconded) we refer the document to an ad hoc committee to consist of the Chair of the Senate, the Chair of the Faculty and Mr. Mixsell, Administrative Services Coordinator.

Motion carried

Report of the Faculty Governance Committee

Postponed. Kelly said he will have a package, with the committee's recommendations, in the hands of the Senators soon.

Report of the Education Policy Commission (Calendar item 752, Docket number 648)

Russ Campbell spoke on behalf of the EPC. The first issue was a response to the question of course substitutions for students with learning disabilities. The EPC recommends that, instead of a policy, it should be a procedure within the Office of the Provost.

McDevitt said as such the Senate would not have to consider it.

Utz moved (Jurgenson seconded) that the Senate receive the report of the Education Policy Commision.

Discussion followed.

Concerns included worry that administrators were making decisions reserved for faculty. However, course substitution requires a student request which goes through the necessary steps, including student advisor and department heads who sign off, so it is not strictly an administrative decision.

Motion carried.

Campbell summarized the revisions of the policy on Make-up work and missed classes as approved by the EPC on February 25, 2000. He said they were unable to figure out who submitted them, but they read through them and modified the present policy.

McDevitt said they were from two separate entities; one of them was Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council and the other was from a faculty member.

The revision of the policy was included in printed matter handed out to Senators. It reads:

Policy on Make-up Work and Missed Classes

The responsibility for attending classes rests with the student. As the citizens of Iowa have every right to assume, students at UNI are expected to attend class. This idea is neither novel nor unreasonable. Students should realize that an hour missed cannot be relived, that work can seldom be made up 100%, and that made-up work seldom equals the original experience in class.

It is the expressed focus of the University of Northern Iowa to further the educational

development of its students. On occasion events will necessitate a student's absence from class. In order for both faculty and students to effectively plan for these absences, the following procedures are recommended:

1. All parties involved should be made aware of scheduled absences well ahead of the date(s) of absence. In the case of extra-curricular activities, a semester long schedule should be prepared and distributed at the beginning of the semester. In instances where semester-long schedules are not feasible, two weeks written notification shall be given for absences. This notification shall take place even if the absence is potential rather than definite. Assuming the appropriate notification has been provided, students and faculty shall mutually agree as to how assignments, lectures, exams, etc. shall be made up. The type and extent of make-up work shall be at the discretion of the faculty member.
2. Occasionally there will occur situations where two weeks notice is impossible. On these occasions students, faculty, and others concerned should work closely together to ascertain whether special arrangements can and/or should be made.
3. Faculty shall not penalize a student for missing a class or exam for an educationally appropriate activity.
4. Where situations of irreconcilable disagreement occur which are not reserved at the department level, a panel comprised of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or that officer's designee, the Department Head of the academic department involved, and a representative of the extra-curricular program (where applicable) shall meet at their earliest convenience with the faculty member and the student to mediate the matter.

Jurgenson moved (Countryman seconded) to approve the recommendations of the Educational Policy Commission.

Discussion deferred to the next meeting. Romanin asked what the modifications were. Campbell responded that they restored the opening paragraph from previous wording approved by the Senate; did some phraseology to make it look like it addressed more than athletics on occasion; the word "penalize" in number 3, not that the student will not suffer from missing class, but just that faculty members will not penalize them specifically for the act of missing class; number 4 they put in the Department Head as an intermediary before going to a higher level. (Romanin wanted to know what we were deferring.) McDevitt will make sure Senators have a copy of the proposal that went to the EPC.

Strategic Plan - Continued discussion.

McDevitt announced that the Joint Open Forum Meeting with the P & S and, hopefully, the other divisions, will be in the Board Room at 2:45 on Tuesday, April 18.

Terlip said the Strategic Planning Committee had done the best they could and would welcome any changes that would make the plan better and more acceptable.

Allen Rapport asked what documents the committee looked at. Did they look at other strategic

plans, like Iowa and Iowa State? Terlip replied that they had looked at UNI's old plan, all the reconciliation drafts from the old plan; Iowa State and Iowa's plan; the Board of Regents guidelines for what had to be in the plan and how it had to be done; advice President Koob gave them; plus all the feedback from the faculty members via the web site. Groups also met with their constituencies and brought back that.

McDevitt reported that Ira Simet is continuing his work and may or may not attend the last Senate meeting of this year.

McDevitt said one of the things we could do would be to have the Senate determine some priorities within the plan and communicate those priorities. Whether or not we actually change, make suggestions for alterations in the plan, or that we make suggestions for priority items in the plan, is something else we could do.

Terlip asked if we are doing the reconciliation process differently or are we not going to do that? Podolefsky responded that his understanding was that, given the amount of consultation there was, the choice the President was laying out was that if this seems to be pretty close to "it" for all the groups that we don't need to go through the reconciliation committee process. This is good enough. If there are differences, if any of the groups don't like the plan and want to modify it, then this would constitute the reconciliation committee, which we did last time, and the groups would all have members and they would provide their feedback. It appears we are now at the point where we were last time before we had a reconciliation committee which did that.

McDevitt said there are a few kinds of things we can do: 1. We can recommend changes to it. 2. We can recommend prioritization of certain items within it. She said she doubted if that materially change it and probably would not kick in the reconciliation committee, but it would establish our priorities as the Senate. 3. We can recommend changes in the process. By way of parenthetically, there was a meeting with Ira Simet on Friday and he is close to the end of his process, but he could not guarantee that it would come before us on the 24th. Whenever he is done the Senate will receive those recommendations. Romanin questioned prioritizing. By carving up one portion of it you begin to defeat the idea that the plan is from all of us as an institution. Terlip said that was the intent of the committee and that is why they took out the goal areas. It becomes too difficult to determine whose priorities are the most important. Nelson said it would seem a compromise position is not necessarily to prioritize but to examine the goals and to determine if we think they meet the stated criteria of the committee. If for some reason the Senate believes that a goal does not, we could forward our belief and rationale for that belief so that we have some feedback to the committee.

McDevitt asked that representatives from the Senate be present at the Open Forum Meeting on April 18, especially people on the Strategic Plan Committee. Discussion on the Strategic Plan will continue at the April 24 Senate meeting.

Phil East asked for clarification as to whether or not Merit staff will be included in the Open Forum. They will.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

656 Report of the Calendar Committee

The cover page sets out the primary objective of bringing the calendar forward at this time. (We are currently in a calendar which we reviewed, but didn't approve the way it is set up, about two years ago. The one we are in is set up through the summer of 2002.) The reason to bring the calendar forward at this time was the alterations of the summer terms.

Sue Koch gave a little background on the calendar committee, which is a Presidential Committee, and consists of Jim Kelly, Faculty Representative; Nick Arnold, Student Representative; Phil Patton, Committee Coordinator and Staff Representative; and Sue Koch, Administrative Representative. The committee comes to the Senate to ask for support for their proposal for a change in the summer school schedule. These changes were brought about because of a kind of "defacto" May term in 1999. Students and faculty were interested in the idea.

The proposed changes are for additional instructional periods for the summer term, beginning in May of 2001:

1. A 4-week instructional period beginning on the first Monday following spring commencement. (May)
2. A 6-week instructional period beginning on the first Monday following spring commencement. (May)
3. A 6-week instructional period beginning on the Monday after completion of the first 6-week instructional period and ending upon the completion of all summer sessions. (Mid-June to the end of July)

These changes would be revisions to the current 2001-2002 calendar and for the 2003-2007 calendars.

Mixsell reported that we were faced with potential liability last year when the "defacto" May term was offered. These included health services, counseling service, not to mention adequate support at the Library, computer centers and various other support agencies. Mixsell said the committee attempted to find out how those people felt about offering a May term and what the pros and cons were. This information was turned over to the Calendar Committee.

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) we approve the recommendations of the Calendar Committee regarding the revised Academic Calendars for 2001-2002.

Discussion followed on what the impacts of this proposal might be.

Nick Arnold feels this is a plus for students to be able to take classes in May, especially graduating seniors who are short a class or credits, since many jobs begin the first part of June. This way they don't have to put off their employment till later in the summer. Also it lets other students get out earlier for the summer jobs. Arnold feels that students will prefer the May class rather than going home for a month and then returning for summer classes.

Provost Podolefsky reported that last year's summer session was the largest we have had and that the May session was the largest of the three sessions. He said that his office received many requests for a May term from both faculty and students.

Other questions/concerns were:

Has the possibility of dropping the July term in favor of the May and June terms been discussed? It is felt that the July session will not be dropped as many faculty prefer it.

Concern over budgetary implications. Without a doubt we will have to scale back support services from the levels promised during the academic year. However it is felt that is more of a positive than a negative that we will have to work into. In most of our offices, other than the Health Center, we have some 12 month people in most of our units, so we may simply respond initially by keeping staffed at our current level. In the Health Center it has been talked about possibly bringing in one physician, one nurse and one receptionist to try to respond to the demand.

In reference to technology Student Services says they are trying to find new ways to make those adjustments. Possibly bringing buildings on and off line is an idea. If this is what students and faculty want, we will have to work around the all the obstacles.

Weeg reported that the Library Faculty Senate had met and passed following resolution:

The Library Faculty Senate has concerns about the proposed May sessions and the Library's ability to offer necessary services to the University community. Should May sessions be implemented the Library Faculty Senate believes that the Library should provide the same range and types of library services throughout the entire expanded summer term, May through June. Doing so would either require additional resources or reallocation of existing resources resulting in diminished services to students, faculty and staff throughout the year.

(What this means is that unless additional resources come to the Library, reduction in the hours the Library is staffed and the hours it is open throughout the entire year.)

Herb Safford, Dean of the Library, reported that part of the problem is that they may have to adjust their contractual circumstances because vacations are defined by the break periods. Employees do not have a nine month, plus summer, contract; they have to work all of the terms and there is no provision for them doing that. If they are going to have non-administrative faculty, basically the professional reference librarians, instructors, etc., they have to make this kind of adjustment. This has not been discussed in any meeting so far. Along with a budgetary issue, there is the contractual issue to be addressed. Safford's concern is not for or against the calendar, but rather that the Senate is clear about the case may arise, in which, during the regular year, they may not be able to deliver certain services at certain hours because we are adding hours to the calendar. Basically, Safford said, his concern is that the Senate, in their representative capacity, and wisdom as faculty, want to endorse the kind of program which will have diminished library services.

Mixsell said nobody knows what an announced, planned, May term will do for us. All we have in terms of experience is the traditional May-June and some ad hoc, unannounced, unadvertised May terms. We are dealing with an unknown which is both a pro and a con. We won't know until we try, what all the ramifications will be. As the Provost said we need to try for a year or two and see what it does.

East voiced concern that this proposal doesn't seem to be a trial issue, but rather a permanent one. Koch replied that there is nothing that says we have to buy into this 6 week trial term, but

that the Board of Regents will not allow us to continue to have a "defacto" term. It has to be a change in calendar in order to do it. Iowa State and Iowa have been doing this for a number of years already, so our students can go to either of those institutions to get the May term, but they prefer to here. East said another concern of his is that the six week term makes it difficult to advise students.

Christenson said he has had many good comments from students regarding the May term except for the lack of library availability.

Podolefsky said that most of the negative e-mail he has received has been about the December break and not the summer schedule.

Utz said, in his opinion, the six week courses are better for students, especially when it comes to graduate education and research papers, and being able to get materials through inter-library loan.

Ogbondah asked about the level of difficulty in getting services during the experimental May terms we had in the past. Safford replied that the library was closed after 5:00 pm and on weekends.

Jurgenson views the six week calendar as positive because it gives new venue for some other arrangements for courses.

Kelly said students view the May term as an opportunity to take some courses which they were not able to work into their schedule during the regular academic year when they are taking a full load. The faculty needs to think about what they can and cannot offer in this particular alignment, but it does give students and faculty some nice options.

Romanin stated that another reason to do this is that we do need a formal approval so that, for purposes of tuition charges, for purposes of financial aid, contractual issues both in the Library and other divisions, so that we have something in place that causes us to know that this is worth going through a number of changes. We have to have some latitude and Romanin sees this as giving the faculty the capacity to begin to look at questions, for instance, the tuition for the fall kicks in in the summer; so for budgeting purposes, we need to have these periods firmed up in the calendar for some of the logistical items that are important. We can't change appointments of people from one month to the other or even schedule people to work if they are for times that aren't really in the calendar.

Weeg asked if there was data collected that compared grades of students in these three or four week courses compared to their normal GPA? What was the percent of failure? Koch replied that there was not. Weeg asked if there will be an attempt to gather this kind of data, to look at the pedagogical impact - the impact on student retention and student persistence to graduation? Koch replied that there isn't any difference in the 4 week class taught in May and the one taught in June.

Arnold stated he believed that by adding another course, it would help/encourage students in completing their education in 4 to 4 ½ years as opposed to 5, and making their financial burden less and hoped that logistics could be worked out.

Nelson restated her motion to approve the recommendation for revision of the current calendar which is 2000 through summer 2002.

Motion carried with 2 no votes.

Discussion on the winter break was deferred to a later date.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

657 Request for Changes to Policies for Graduating with Honors

Jurgenson moved (Utz seconded) to send this to the EPC Committee
Motion carried.

658 Request for Emeritus Status, Charles Strein, Department of Economics

Nelson moved (Cooper seconded) to approve.
Motion carried.

659 Receive report of the Committee on Admission and Retention

Nelson moved (Terlip seconded) that we receive the report.
Motion carried.

Discussion:

Cooper reported she had been there as a substitute and felt it was well written and very little different from past years.

Bowlin asked if the Academic Calendar for 2003-2007 would be on the docket for the next meeting or for next year. No decision was made.

Romanin moved (Christensen seconded) to adjourn.
Motion to adjourn carried
Meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Prepared by Judy Schreiber